To: Paul, Sabu[SPaul@mbakerintl.com]
Cc: Shaikh, Taimur[Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov]; Tony Donigian[Tony.Donigian@respec.com]
From: Anurag Mishra
Sent: Tue 4/24/2018 9:55:06 PM
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

From what I remember from that comparison, the local land loadings mostly increased. Primarily because the factor changed from 0.28 to 1 for most constituents.

Do try and adjust the factors and let's compare the results.

~A

ANURAG MISHRA
650.962.1864 office // 650.395.7224 cell

From: Paul, Sabu <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 2:36 PM
To: Anurag Mishra <Anurag.Mishra@respec.com>
Cc: Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Anurag,
OK, sure. How about the increase in loads for the other parameters?

Regards,
Sabu.

From: Anurag Mishra [mailto:Anurag.Mishra@respec.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Paul, Sabu <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>
Cc: Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Sabu

The Tables 82, 85, and 81 are for local loads only for the EFDC. We were trying to match standards at the reaches. Once the standards are met, these tables are modified. The UCI that I sent after 72% global reductions did have these reductions.

For generating EFDC loads, these tables must be modified for 93% reduction in OK.

~A

ANURAG MISHRA
650.962.1864 office // 650.395.7224 cell

From: Paul, Sabu <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 2:00 PM
To: Anurag Mishra <Anurag.Mishra@respec.com>
Cc: Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Anurag,
I thought that the reductions within Oklahoma was also modified by Taim, something different from 93%. However, I now see that tables 82, 85, and 81 have no reduction at all (if I am not mistaken).

Regards,
Sabu.

From: Anurag Mishra [mailto:Anurag.Mishra@respec.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 3:37 PM
To: Paul, Sabu <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>; slu@dsllc.com; 'Chris Wallen' <cmwallen@dsllc.com>
Cc: Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Paul

Look at the MASS-LINK tables 82, 85, and 81 for 1MultiSim_TPLD.uci. These tables provide output to the COPY blocks for local loads calculation for the Lake Tenkiller. These three MASSS-LINK tables must be updated to show 93% reduction for Oklahoma.

~A

ANURAG MISHRA
650.962.1864 office // 650.395.7224 cell

From: Paul, Sabu <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 12:06 PM
To: Anurag Mishra <Anurag.Mishra@respec.com>; slu@dsllc.com; 'Chris Wallen' <cmwallen@dsllc.com>
Cc: Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Anurag,

Here are the UCI files.

1. IRW_SCEN_72PCTGLOBAL.uci – this the uci corresponding to the 72% global reductions.
2. 1MultiSim_TPLD.uci – this is the uci corresponding to the latest reduction scenario.

Regards,
Sabu.

From: Anurag Mishra [mailto:Anurag.Mishra@respec.com]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 4:42 PM
To: slu@dsllc.com; Paul, Sabu <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>; 'Chris Wallen' <cmwallen@dsllc.com>
Cc: Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: EXTERNAL: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Sabu

Could you please send me the two final UCI files that were used to generate each scenario? I would like to compare the two UCI files to figure out the reason for the differences.

Thanks
~A

ANURAG MISHRA
650.962.1864 office // 650.395.7224 cell

From: Silong Lu <slu@dsllc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2018 1:00 PM
To: 'Paul, Sabu' <SPaul@mbakerintl.com>; 'Chris Wallen' <cmwallen@dsllc.com>
Cc: Anurag Mishra <Anurag.Mishra@respec.com>; Shaikh Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Pltgen for the final scenario

Hi Sabu,

See the attached excel file. We did a quick loading comparison between the 72% reduction and the final scenario. It appears that the loading from the local watershed that directly drains into the lake is increased and the loading from other tributaries such as Illinois River is reduced. The overall loading of the final scenario is reduced. Not sure if this is what you expected.

Silong Lu, Ph.D, P.E., D. WRE|Voice: 865-212-3331 Ext 26|Fax: 865-212-3398|Email: slu@dsllc.com|www.dsllc.com

---

From: Paul, Sabu [mailto:SPaul@mbakerintl.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Silong Lu (slu@dsllc.com); Chris Wallen (cmwallen@dsllc.com)
Cc: Anurag Mishra; shaikh.taimur@epa.gov
Subject: Pltgen for the final scenario

Hi Silong/Chris,
Please find attached the PLTGEN files for the final scenario run. This corresponds a slightly different reductions (as opposed to 72%) and changes in bed load contributions. Take a look at the files and let me know if there is any issues. Since, I generated these for the first time, I would like someone to take a look at the data before using them.

Regards,
Sabu.

Sabu Paul, Ph.D, P.E., PMP

Senior Technical Manager
Michael Baker International
9400 Innovation Drive, Suite 110 | Manassas, VA
[O] 703-334-4917 | [M] 571-606-3705
spaul@mbakerintl.com | www.mbakerintl.com